

SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT FOR THE
OCCUPATIONAL MEDICINE AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH CONTRACT
LYNDON B. JOHNSON SPACE CENTER

On September 12, 2005, I along with several officials of the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center (JSC), met with members of the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals for the Occupational Medicine and Occupational Health (OMOH) contract, which is planned for a 3-year performance period, with seven, 1-year award term periods, scheduled to begin on December 1, 2005. The contract will be a performance based, completion type, cost-plus-award-term, with performance incentive fee. The OMOH contract provides support services for the institutional occupational health and human test support programs at JSC, the Sonny Carter Training Facility, Ellington Field, White Sands Test Facility (WSTF), and Russia. Services include: operation of the JSC Occupational Health Clinic; health promotion; field occupational health; support to the human test support program; JSC emergency response team support; WSTF industrial hygiene program and clinic operations; and operation of the Russian medical health services support program, the Occupational and Environmental Health Laboratory, the JSC Flight Medicine Clinic, and the first aid clinic of Space Center Houston.

A draft Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued February 2, 2005, and a pre-proposal conference and facility tour were conducted February 16, 2005. On March 23, 2005, the final RFP was posted on the Internet. Proposals were due on April 25, 2005, and timely proposals were received from the following firms:

Comprehensive Health Services (CHS)
Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC)
Wyle Laboratories, Inc. (Wyle)

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, the SEB developed four Mission Suitability evaluation subfactors. The RFP described these subfactors and listed the relative importance and weighting of each as set forth below:

Technical Approach	450
Management Approach	300
Safety and Health Approach	150
Small Disadvantaged Business Participation	100

In addition to Mission Suitability, the RFP identified and the SEB evaluated Cost and Past Performance. These were not numerically scored. The RFP also provided for downward adjustment of offerors' Mission Suitability scores up to 300 points based on cost realism, which was defined as the process of independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of each offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the amounts proposed were realistic for the work to be performed; reflected a clear understanding of the requirements; and were consistent with each offeror's technical and management approaches.

The RFP stated that the Factors of Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. As related to each other, Mission Suitability and Past Performance are approximately equal.

After a preliminary review of all proposals, the SEB determined that all three of the proposals were acceptable. The Board then performed a thorough evaluation of the proposals. At the conclusion of this initial evaluation, it was determined that two of the three offerors were in the competitive range.

The proposal of CSC was rated as Fair overall in Mission Suitability. The proposal was evaluated as having a Good in Small Disadvantaged Business Participation, Fair in Safety and Health Approach, and Poor in both Management Approach and Technical Approach. Although the Board identified several significant strengths in the proposal, these were counterbalanced by numerous significant weaknesses, as well as a deficiency, and it was separated from the two top ranked proposals by a substantial margin in Mission Suitability score. CSC's proposal was somewhat competitive in probable cost (although it was highest of the three offerors), and it was rated as Good in Past Performance. It was, therefore, concluded that the CSC proposal did not represent one of the highest rated proposals and it was not considered further. CSC was notified by letter on July 13, 2005.

The Board invited the remaining offerors to participate in written and oral discussions, and both were given the opportunity to correct, clarify, substantiate, or confirm the contents of their proposals and to submit a final proposal revision and a signed model contract reflecting the offeror's intent to be bound contractually. The SEB, after considering the results of the written and oral discussions and final proposal revisions, concluded its final evaluation and ranked the proposals in the following order of Mission Suitability scores:

CHS
Wyle

The proposal of CHS was scored the somewhat higher of the two, receiving an overall Mission Suitability rating of Very Good. CHS' proposal was rated as Excellent in Technical Approach and Safety and Health Approach, Very Good in Management Approach, and as Good in Small Disadvantaged Business Participation. Significant strengths included: use of subcontractors that specialize in their proposed areas of responsibility, which significantly benefits the overall performance capability of the proposed team; a phase-in plan with a high level of detail to facilitate a smooth transition; comprehensive conflict of interest mitigation plan that proactively addresses and mitigates conflicts before they arise; a proposed program manager with a combination of credentials and experience which will increase the likelihood of successful contract performance; demonstrated strong, highly effective understanding of the information technology needs of the contract; and an excellent safety, health and environmental compliance plan that is

fully developed and ready for immediate implementation. There were numerous strengths reported, and only one weakness. The reported weakness was that CHS has proposed a temporary lead physician to fill in until the permanent lead physician obtains a Texas medical license, which presents concerns regarding contract transition and performance.

Wyle's proposal was scored only slightly lower and was also rated as Very Good. The proposal of Wyle was rated as Excellent in the subfactors of Technical Approach and Management Approach, and Good in the subfactors of Safety and Health Approach and Small Disadvantaged Business Participation. The Board documented the following significant strengths: key personnel and critical positions staffed with individuals highly experienced in performing similar tasks; exceptionally well qualified program manager; highly effective and innovative organizational structure and operating plans; highly effective structure and implementation of the communication plan using automated tools which will facilitate communications with JSC customers; well developed plan for backup coverage for all critical positions; comprehensive Total Compensation Plan with highly attractive benefits that will ensure highly skilled and qualified personnel will be recruited, hired, and retained; numerous proposed technical enhancements which will greatly improve the quality of OMOH programs at JSC; proposed multi-faceted data integration plan which will allow significantly improved access and interoperability of the data; and an excellent risk matrix that demonstrates a clear understanding of the work and the associated risk issues in a way that will significantly increase Wyle's effectiveness in the operations of the OMOH clinic. The Wyle proposal also had numerous strengths. Remaining weaknesses included: failure to meet the Statement of Work requirement for registered nurses in the occupational medical clinic; incomplete and erroneous data in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, which prevented evaluation of potential performance against goals; and a lack of complete staffing for the Starport Fitness Center.

The Board performed the cost analysis contemplated by the RFP, made the necessary adjustments to the costs proposed, and arrived at a probable cost for each offeror. These adjustments did not result in a Mission Suitability offset for either of the proposals. I discussed in detail the method of cost analysis with the Board, specifically inquiring as to how probable cost adjustments were performed for each offeror, to assure myself that the adjustments were both sound and consistent with the offerors' respective approaches. Although the probable cost of CHS was slightly lower than that of Wyle by a very narrow margin, the costs were so close, particularly viewed over the life of the contract, as to be essentially equal.

Under the Factor of Past Performance, both companies were rated as Excellent. The SEB reported that Wyle had a significant strength in its long history of excellent performance on highly relevant contracts, which demonstrated the company's capability to perform the contract tasks at a high level of competence. Wyle was also assessed strengths for its high probability of superior safety and health performance as reflected in the past performance data and Wyle's Voluntary Protection Plan (VPP) Star Certification. It was also noted favorably that Wyle has current International Standards Organization (ISO) 9001:2000 certification, which meets a contractual requirement a year early. The past performance of CHS was assessed as having a significant strength in that its sole business and focus is

providing OMOH and environmental health services. The Board concluded that this proven experience and depth of knowledge significantly increases the likelihood of successful contract performance. The SEB also recognized as strengths CHS' successful past safety and health performance, its ISO 9001:2000 and VPP Star status at JSC, and its recognition by NASA for its proven excellence in quality and performance as a subcontractor member of the Space Gateway Support Team. Both offerors had a number of weaknesses that were assessed initially in their respective past performance, but in every instance each weakness was addressed by the offerors during discussions and deemed by the Board to have been mitigated by acceptable corrective action such that the weaknesses were no longer considered to detract from the offerors' ratings of Excellent.

During the presentation by the Board, the various JSC officials present, along with members of the Board, were encouraged to provide me with their opinions and comments regarding the Board's findings. I quizzed the Board members regarding their rationale behind various findings and, with one area of disagreement as discussed in greater detail below, I was satisfied with the quality and results of their analyses. In examining and comparing all of the findings, some balanced each other out between the proposals, some of the rest were of lesser consequence to me, while others were manifestly discriminators. In examining the findings of the SEB and the relative rankings of the firms in the Mission Suitability subfactors, including the various strengths reported for the offerors, I made a qualitative assessment of the benefits to the Government arising from the strengths as well as the risk to successful contract performance represented by the remaining weaknesses. In reviewing the Final Report presented to me, I was satisfied that the Board had done a thorough job of evaluating the proposals and that overall, with some exceptions as noted, its findings were sound.

While the discussion below generally focuses on findings I found to be discriminators during my deliberations in making my source selection decision, I weighed the relative value or risks to the Government of all the findings.

My preliminary comparison of the two companies was in the Technical Approach subfactor. As a framework for my deliberations, it was initially noted that from a quantitative standpoint, both Wyle and CHS were rated as Excellent, and the two companies were relatively close in numerical scores, although Wyle's proposal was scored somewhat higher. The Wyle proposal had three significant strengths in this area, as opposed to CHS' one.

Turning to the qualitative aspects of the two proposals under this subfactor, I first examined their similarities. Both offerors had comparable strengths for demonstrated understanding of the OMOH effort as reflected in their respective responses to the technical scenarios contained in the RFP; both selectively increased minimum qualifications for targeted personnel, which will enhance contract performance in those areas; and both proposed approaches which will increase awareness of contract personnel to workplace hazards at JSC, which will improve the quality of the overall OMOH program. Regarding these strengths, I concluded that although they offered value to the

Government, each of the relative values of these strengths was balanced by the other such that they were not discriminators.

In examining the differences between the two proposals in this subfactor, I first noted that Wyle had three significant strengths which had no counterparts in the CHS proposal. The first of these was Wyle's numerous proposed technical enhancements which will greatly improve the quality of OMOH programs at JSC. These included standards which will ensure physician credentials exceeding contract requirements; efficient processes for pharmaceuticals and other medications for the Occupational Medicine Clinic and the Flight Medicine Clinic; digital radiography and digital electrocardiography which will result in faster interpretation of patient studies and enhanced record keeping and retrieval; several innovations to enhance the operation and increase the effectiveness of the cardiopulmonary laboratory, ensuring high quality medical care to all cardiopulmonary patients; a number of program enhancements to meet the increasing mental health needs of the JSC workforce; and improved medical review officer services which will maintain necessary rigor and decrease the risk to NASA. Combined, all of these represent great value to the Government in that they will enhance both the quality and efficiency of contract performance, thus ensuring delivery of optimum OMOH services to the JSC population and the subsequent increased likelihood of greater health and safety.

An additional significant strength was assessed by the SEB for Wyle's proposed multi-faceted data integration plan, which will allow significantly improved access to and interoperability of the data. An electronic medical records system will be readily available throughout JSC facilities, which will greatly enhance the efficiency of data exchange and the ability to access and analyze requirements quickly. Wyle also proposed to integrate all health databases, which will permit data sharing among disciplines and more efficient cross referencing of data. Finally, the use of tools for remote access to the data will allow more efficient data entry and retrieval. This overarching data integration plan is of significant value to the Government because it will greatly increase the quality of contract operations by managing all data effectively and efficiently, thus permitting better and more flexible usage of the data, resulting in improved contract performance.

Wyle's third significant strength in this subfactor was for its proposed excellent risk matrix that demonstrated a clear understanding of the work and the associated risk issues in a way that will greatly increase Wyle's effectiveness in the operation of the OMOH contract. A risk profile was developed for each area of the Statement of Work, together with well conceived, effective mitigation of each risk, which demonstrated Wyle's excellent and in-depth understanding of the OMOH effort. Thorough risk identification and associated mitigation of those risks provides the Government with substantial value because reduction of risk will result in a safer and more effective operation of the OMOH program at JSC.

In the area of strengths, it was noted by the Board that Wyle demonstrated an excellent understanding of the management and treatment of workplace injuries and illnesses, from inception through successful return to work, including addressing the need for prompt diagnosis and reporting. This is of value to the Government because it will improve both the substantive care and the associated recordkeeping involved in workplace related

injuries and illnesses. In addition, Wyle proposed a very positive, proactive approach to improving work efficiency and communications by identifying other onsite industrial hygiene operations to leverage and share ideas and information, and to discuss overlapping assessment activities in regularly scheduled meetings of an established working group. This innovative approach is valuable to the Government because it will result in less duplication of work across contracts, increase openness of discussion of various contractors' health programs, increase program compliance, and enhance the level of OMOH contract performance.

Turning to the CHS proposal, the Board assessed a significant strength in the Technical Approach Subfactor for CHS' demonstrated strong, highly effective understanding of the information technology (IT) needs of the contract which appreciably improves the potential for contract success. CHS proposed to integrate OMOH databases to provide better security, integrity, and access, and provided a summary of current IT issues and concerns, along with its approach for managing and fixing any problems. CHS plans to use its previously developed innovative hygiene information system, which will be capitalized upon to enhance IT applications on the OMOH contract. The comprehensive approach CHS described for its planned IT activities as a means for accomplishing required tasks exceeded contract requirements. This included use of electronic tools for data collection and reporting, which will provide more efficient use of personnel resources. The overall approach to IT demonstrated CHS' corporate knowledge of the IT needs of occupational medicine operations which, coupled with the specific tools proposed, is of great value to the Government in that it will measurably enhance CHS' ability to provide effective management of the OMOH contract software and improve contract performance.

Strengths reported by the SEB included the utilization of occupational health nurses to perform certain physicals, which would lead to more efficient operations of the clinic. This is of value to the Government because it will free physicians for more complex activities, thus increasing contract efficiency. In addition, it was viewed as a strength that CHS proposed additional staffing of physicians for human test support, which is of benefit to the Government in that it makes it unlikely that Government physicians will be necessary to backfill. Further, CHS proposed to provide a hyperbaric medicine physician who is a leading and recognized expert in the field, available by phone for immediate consultation with technicians during emergency recall, which is of value in that it will improve care to the test subjects and increase successful contract performance. The final strength noted by the Board in this subfactor was that CHS proposed to hire expert consultants for the environmental health laboratory and for safety and health training, which benefits the Government because such expertise will increase the probability of excellent contract performance in these areas.

In comparing the two offerors in the subfactor of Technical Approach, I was impressed with the substantive quality of Wyle's multiple significant strengths, as opposed to the quality of CHS' one significant strength. While CHS' IT plan is noteworthy, I considered Wyle's totally integrated data management approach to be of much greater value to the Government in that it offered a more comprehensive improvement of contract performance across multiple contract functions. In addition, it was clear that Wyle's multiple

innovative approaches to contract performance, as well as its thorough and effective approach to risk management, offered significantly greater value to the Government in enhancing the quality of OMOH services. The proposal of CHS offered no comparable advantages in this area.

Likewise, in the strengths exhibited by each company's proposal under Technical Approach, Wyle's proposed consolidation of disparate contractors' knowledge and experience regarding industrial hygiene operations, and its demonstrated in-depth understanding of the management and treatment of workplace injuries and illnesses, appeared to me to be of much greater benefit to the Government than the strengths of the CHS proposal, which although they provided some efficiencies as well as improved contract performance, did not have the broader application inherent in the Wyle strengths.

Accordingly, I concluded that there was a much greater qualitative disparity between the two proposals in the Technical Approach subfactor than the adjective and point ratings convey, and determined that the proposal of Wyle enjoyed a substantial advantage to the Government over that of CHS in that subfactor.

I next compared the offerors in the subfactor of Management Approach. From a quantitative standpoint, I took note that Wyle received six significant strengths and four strengths in this area, receiving a score of Excellent. I compared this with CHS' Very Good, with four significant strengths and five strengths. Wyle had three remaining weaknesses to CHS' one.

In conducting a more detailed review under this subfactor, I initially did a comparison of the offerors' remaining weaknesses. The first of Wyle's three was that it had failed to meet a Statement of Work requirement for registered nurses in the Occupational Medical Clinic. In quizzing the members of the SEB in this respect, I learned that this weakness had been conveyed to Wyle during discussions. Wyle's response was to state in its final proposal revision that it would meet the contract requirement and staff the clinic with registered nurses. However, Wyle's basis of estimate still referenced a licensed vocational nurse (LVN) for this area. I considered Wyle's correction of the weakness in the text of its proposal to override the apparently inadvertent retention of the LVN in the basis of estimate. Accordingly, I did not attach much weight to this weakness.

Turning to the second weakness documented in the Wyle proposal, the detailed finding indicated that there was an inconsistency in the dollar values of subcontracts listed in a particular table contained in the proposed Subcontracting Plan. As with the weakness noted above, this appeared to me to be more of an editorial error than a substantive problem with the Wyle proposal. Therefore, while I agreed with the Board that such discrepancies warrant consideration, I did not weigh them as significant impediments to Wyle's performance under the contract. It is further noted in this regard that the SEB was impressed with the amount of detailed data contained throughout the Wyle proposal. However, one fallout of proposing in such detail was that it created greater potential for such minor editorial inconsistencies and errors.

The last weakness reported in the Wyle proposal under this subfactor was a failure to provide adequate staffing for the Starport Fitness Center. This was the result of a change in Wyle's final proposal revision, which removed a number of part-time fitness trainers and staffed the Fitness Center with a limited number of full time physical fitness personnel, which was inconsistent with the hours of operation required. Although I considered this weakness to be of more substance than the two discussed immediately above, I did not consider it to be of great impact to the Wyle proposal in that it would be easily correctible should Wyle be awarded the OMOH contract. In fact, it was also noted that Wyle proposed sufficient personnel overall such that the cost proposal did not need to be adjusted to accommodate the one or two additional Fitness Center personnel.

CHS had only one remaining weakness in the Management Approach subfactor, which was that the company proposed to utilize a licensed physician temporarily for fulfilling Texas' medical licensing requirements for the lead physician, pending the proposed permanent lead physician obtaining a Texas license. In addition, the proposed program manager was relieved of all medical duties until his license is obtained. The Board noted that this plan is "less than optimal," and presented some risk to the Government in that it could result in less than adequate contract performance. It was noted that this weakness was a deficiency prior to discussions in that CHS had failed to recognize the requirement for obtaining Texas medical licenses, and that the time remaining before contract award was not sufficient to obtain such licenses. While CHS' solution is a workable patch and removes the deficiency, I found the remaining weakness to be of greater weight than the Board had concluded. OMOH services are critical to the operation of the Center and its mission, including the well being of civil service, contractor, and astronaut personnel. To have the role of lead physician filled by a temporary placeholder could adversely impact contract performance at the crucial time of contract phase-in and transition, when the effort is already vulnerable to disruption and a diminution in quality. Further, this weakness cannot be corrected until and unless Texas issues the necessary medical licenses to the proposed individuals. Although Wyle's proposal properly did not warrant a strength for meeting contract requirements in this area, I nevertheless found Wyle's licensed permanent personnel to be of greater value to the Government than the temporary personnel solution proposed by CHS in that Wyle's proposal, relatively speaking, will be less disruptive and more conducive to a smooth transition to the new OMOH contract.

In examining the relative strengths of the two offerors in the Management Approach Subfactor, I initially compared the two proposed program managers. Both companies proposed individuals who represented significant strengths. The individual proposed by Wyle was viewed as exceptionally well qualified, with over 20 years of directly related experience as a civil servant, with the current OMOH incumbent, and as program manager on the former JSC Life Sciences contract. All of this experience is directly applicable to the management of the OMOH contract and will enable overall operating efficiencies and effective communication at all levels of the contract effort. In addition, the proposed Wyle program manager has multiple professional associations and contacts which will be of great value to the OMOH contract in that a variety of medical specialties will be available that can be applied to enhance the quality of medical services provided by Wyle. Further, all references were very positive. In comparison, the proposed CHS program manager is

certified in occupational health, industrial hygiene, and safety, and has extensive experience in occupational and emergency medicine. This combination of knowledge and demonstrated skills will ensure successful contract performance. In examining the relative merits of both individuals' backgrounds, it was clear that both have the requisite credentials and experience to serve as able program managers on the OMOH contract. However, I considered the proposed Wyle program manager to offer greater value to the Government. His hands on, directly relevant management experience as a member of the JSC community, from both a Government and contractor perspective, will enable him to assume his role with a minimum learning curve. Likewise, his knowledge of and familiarity with all aspects of the JSC OMOH program, together with his medical expertise, will enhance overall OMOH contract performance.

Along with its exceptional program manager, Wyle proposed a cadre of Key Personnel to manage implementation of all aspects of the OMOH contract who represented a strong and highly experienced team. All but one of the key personnel proposed are incumbents who have multiple years of proven high quality experience and demonstrated performance. This familiarity with the OMOH program will result in operating efficiencies, effective communications, and teamwork, thus facilitating excellent performance of the contract. In addition, Wyle proposed highly experienced personnel, along with commitment letters for each of them, for all critical positions required by the contract. This demonstrated Wyle's assurance that these critical positions will be staffed with qualified personnel. I, therefore, concluded that this significant strength is of great value to the Government because it ensures that the contract will be performed by highly capable and knowledgeable personnel. CHS had no comparable strength in this area.

In addition, Wyle proposed a well developed plan for backup coverage for all critical positions, which included an organized matrix which identified specific individuals for all positions. Further, a workable plan for both short and long-term backup for physicians in the Occupational and Flight Medicine Clinics was provided, along with backup coverage for medical support in Russia. This significant strength, which had no counterpart in the CHS proposal, is of notable value to the Government in that by proposing this well thought out and workable approach to ensure availability of critical skills, Wyle dramatically increases its ability to meet and exceed the Government's requirements for sustained quality medical services.

The Board determined an additional significant strength in the Wyle management proposal for its structure and implementation of its communication plan using automated tools which will be highly effective in facilitating communications with JSC, its customers, and other entities. The plan ensures timely, efficient information flow through utilization of a web-based tool for distributing a wide array on contract reportable and wellness data. Use of this communication tool and its multiple databases and capabilities will help to standardize the manner in which key information is communicated, as well as eliminate duplicate communications systems. I found this to be very valuable to the Government

because its proactive approach will improve communications, thus reducing the potential for disruptions, improper or inadvisable actions, and delays due to misunderstandings or lack of information. This will result in better contract performance. There was no strength reported for the CHS proposal in this respect.

An additional significant strength in this subfactor identified in the Wyle proposal was for its highly effective and innovative organizational structure and operating plans that greatly increase the likelihood of successful contract performance. The Wyle organizational structure reflects a clear understanding of the work requirements and how those requirements can be most effectively managed by the key personnel proposed. Innovative grouping of various aspects of the Statement of Work under one manager was seen as logical and beneficial, as the approach will maximize operating effectiveness and efficiencies, reduce or eliminate duplication of effort, and enhance communications among the affected areas. The overall organizational structure is of great value to the Government in that it will visibly streamline and improve management of the contract and subsequently ensure the excellence of technical performance. Further, the functional relationships among the Wyle team members and their managers were clearly identified, and the relative contributions of each were well defined and described. Functional synergisms designed to enhance communication, as well as cross training and cross utilization of personnel are clear, along with the required management levels of responsibility for different actions. This is highly beneficial to the Government because the clear depiction of these functions indicates that the Wyle team has a strong understanding of the work required and will be able to deliver services efficiently and effectively. Finally, Wyle proposed a team of individuals to promote and monitor excellent performance, which has appropriate management participation and visibility. This team will continuously manage the contract data stream from the operations within the contract, which will be available to NASA for program and contract management. This is of notable value and will benefit the Government by allowing a single point of contact for contract and program information, thereby enhancing efficiency and eliminating any confusion in obtaining the data.

CHS had a strength for its organizational structure which emphasized performance effectiveness and efficiency, minimizing risk and enhancing the probability of successful contract performance. The organizational structure is highly responsive to contract requirements, correlating directly with the work breakdown structure of the Statement of Work. Roles of major subcontractors were included, providing a clear rationale for reporting relationships, lines of authority, responsibilities, and accountability among the various subordinate organizations. This integrated approach exceeded the requirements of the RFP and provided for CHS' success in performance effectiveness and minimization of risks. Although the CHS approach was of benefit to the Government, I concluded that the Wyle overall organizational approach had much greater value in that the many facets of its innovative and responsive management structure will significantly enhance the probability of contract success.

The Wyle proposal was assigned a significant strength for its Total Compensation Plan, which included highly attractive benefits in several areas, covering personnel for both Wyle and other team members. The plan provided generous coverage in the areas of

health insurance, life insurance, a 401K savings plan, and vacation time. These attractive benefits are of great value to the Government in that they will ensure that highly skilled and qualified personnel will be recruited, hired, and retained. On the other hand, the CHS proposal was considered to have a strength for its generous vacation schedule and comprehensive life insurance, as well as a strength for immediate fringe benefit coverage. In polling the SEB members as to the distinctions between the offerors' two plans, it was apparent that the plan of Wyle was more comprehensive and that the Board had greater confidence in the plan in that it had been presented in Wyle's original proposal at an excellent level and had not been driven to a higher level through discussions, as had the plan of CHS. I agreed with the Board that the Wyle plan was much more far-reaching than that of CHS and, as such, offered greater benefit to the Government in the likelihood of ensuring attraction and retention of the most capable workforce, thus increasing the potential for sustained excellent contract performance.

I next examined the significant strengths identified in the CHS proposal. One of these was that CHS proposed use of subcontractors that specialize in their proposed areas of responsibility, which is a highly effective management approach and will result in the Government receiving a substantial amount of in-depth skills, experience, and corporate capability, which will directly benefit the operations of the OMOH contract. This is of significant value to the Government because it strengthens the overall performance capability of the proposed team and greatly improves the probability of successful contract performance. The Wyle proposal was determined to have a strength in this area in that Wyle likewise utilizes the corporate competencies of the individual team members which are well suited to the proposed areas of responsibility, including management skills, IT knowledge, occupational medicine and overall medical knowledge, and human test support. However, although of similar value in nature to the CHS proposal, this did not rise to the same level of significance in the Wyle proposal because one of the team members did not have relevant past performance in the area for which it was proposed. Accordingly, I concluded that the CHS proposal offered a greater advantage to the Government in this area.

CHS also received a significant strength for its proposed Phase-in Plan which was detailed, well conceived, and organized to provide a smooth transition of contract work at contract start. Included were a capable transition team headed by the proposed program manager, as well as a recruiting team to ensure the hiring of competent staff. This substantially benefits the Government in that a smooth transition of contract work will greatly increase the ability of the contractor to satisfy all contract requirements at contract start. The Wyle proposal was determined to have a strength for its Phase-in Plan, which identified and addressed the critical milestones of recruiting, staffing, and certification of personnel. The plan, characterized by the SEB as "robust and comprehensive" included the program manager as dedicated phase-in manager and provided uninterrupted continuity of contract work. In reviewing and comparing the Board members' consensus findings in this respect, I concluded that although they considered the CHS plan to be somewhat superior, the

detailed findings did not indicate there was a very substantive difference between the plans. In addition, when I include CHS' lack of a permanent lead physician at contract start (which, as discussed above, I consider to be problematic for a smooth transition), I have determined that the companies are essentially equal in this regard.

Further, the SEB identified a significant strength in the CHS proposal for its comprehensive Conflict of Interest Mitigation Plan, which thoroughly addressed the issue by providing a complete organizational conflict of interest survey and a complete, highly effective organizational conflict of interest avoidance strategy for each element in the survey. This plan, which adopts a highly proactive approach to mitigate conflicts as they arise, is of great value to the Government because it significantly increases the likelihood of successful contract performance through the mitigation or avoidance of organizational conflicts of interest which might otherwise compromise performance. The Wyle proposal was assessed as having a strength in this regard for its effective Conflict of Interest Mitigation Plan, which contained specific examples of potential conflicts with a management plan for mitigating and eliminating risks associated with potential conflicts. The plan provides specific processes for identifying and managing conflicts, and was both well conceived and comprehensive. While I considered that there was not that great a disparity between the substantive values of the offerors' two plans, it was clear that the CHS plan was more comprehensive and detailed. Thus, while I considered that both companies had addressed this issue with plans that exceeded RFP requirements and would manage any OMOH contract organizational conflicts successfully, I concluded that CHS enjoyed an advantage over Wyle in this respect.

One other strength was identified in the CHS proposal in the subfactor of Management Approach, which was for its plan on how it will achieve the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's VPP "Star" Site recognition within the first year of OMOH contract performance. The proposed plan includes utilizing a consultant who brings extensive experience and expertise. This demonstrated commitment to the JSC safety philosophy is valuable to the Government because it will enhance the probability of successful contract performance. The Wyle proposal did not offer any comparable strength, although I did note that Wyle and its major team member currently enjoy VPP status onsite and I recognize that they are knowledgeable contractors in this area.

In reviewing, comparing, and contrasting all of the significant strengths, strengths, and remaining weaknesses between the two competitors, I concluded that Wyle's Management Approach was far superior to that of CHS. It was manifest to me that the relative adjective ratings of Excellent for Wyle and Very Good for CHS represented real and measurable differences between them. Wyle's outstanding program manager, excellent team of key personnel, and committed roster of critical personnel, all ensure that the contract will be staffed with highly capable and proficient individuals from contract inception. In addition, Wyle's backup coverage for critical and other medical personnel, as well as its superior Total Compensation Plan, ensure that the contract will continue to be well staffed with capable individuals throughout performance. I was also impressed with Wyle's overarching plan for enhanced communications and its effective and responsive organizational structure. All of these significant strengths together represent an effective,

robust, synergistic management approach which, coupled with Wyle's excellent technical approach, are of considerable value to the Government in that they will ensure excellent performance is sustained throughout the term of the contract. In comparison, CHS offered very little that was not offset by Wyle to some degree. For those areas where the company did excel, such as its proposed use of subcontractors, its Conflict of Interest Mitigation Plan, and its VPP approach, I concluded that any advantages offered in those areas were more than offset by the value offered by the Wyle proposal in the areas just cited. In addition, as discussed above, I considered the remaining weaknesses in the Wyle proposal to be minor in nature, particularly when compared to the remaining weakness regarding the temporary lead physician in the CHS proposal, which I found to be troubling. Therefore, I concluded that Wyle had the clear advantage over CHS in the subfactor of Management Approach.

The next subfactor which was reviewed was that of Small Disadvantaged Business Plan. In this area, both offerors were rated as Good. CHS was evaluated as having no strengths or weaknesses. The Wyle proposal was evaluated as having no strengths and one weakness. The weakness was that a table in the plan contained data which appeared to be inconsistent with data in the text of the plan, which prevented the Board from making a meaningful assessment of the data. In questioning the Board members regarding this finding, it appeared to me to be more of an editorial weakness than a substantive weakness. Regardless, the companies' adjective ratings were identical and the numerical ratings very close. I concluded that the offerors were essentially equal in this subfactor and that neither offered measurable value to the Government over the other.

My analysis next turned to the subfactor of Safety and Health Approach. As mentioned previously, my greatest exception to the Board's findings was in the area of each company's respective Safety, Health, and Environmental Compliance Plan (referred to hereinafter as the Safety Plan). As noted above, Wyle was assessed a Good in the subfactor of Safety and Health Approach, and CHS was assessed an Excellent. In both cases, these adjectives were driven solely by the Safety Plans. In reading the detailed findings, it was not apparent to me why there was such a discrepancy in the offerors' scores. For example, the significant strength for CHS' Safety Plan stated that the plan exhibited "solid, comprehensive understanding of the requirements," whereas the strength for Wyle's proposal indicated that it "provided a ... comprehensive ... plan that meets the requirements ..." Whereas CHS' Safety Plan included a "strong continuous improvement emphasis" and addressed "specific contract related concerns along with the required mitigation and actions," Wyle's Safety Plan demonstrated "a highly developed insight into ... training needs," along with demonstrating "a high state of readiness to implement a safety and health program at high quality levels."

In further questioning the Board members regarding the distinction between the two Safety Plans, they were largely unable to articulate a measurable separation that corresponded in degree to the substantial adjectival and point differences the Board had assigned in quality between them, other than to indicate that they considered CHS' emphasis on continuous improvement to be important. However, it was also discussed that Wyle proposed to maintain its superior rating with respect to its VPP status, which to me indicates that there

was at least an implied commensurate commitment on the part of Wyle to take the steps necessary (including any necessary improvements), to successfully do so. Taking all of this discussion into account, I was therefore of the opinion that the Board either had not adequately evaluated the Safety Plans, or had not fully articulated an otherwise accurate evaluation. Accordingly, I requested the Board to take a fresh look at the Safety Plans (including obtaining the views of an independent safety expert who would be appointed an ex officio member of the SEB), and to report their results to me.

On September 14, 2005, I met with SEB members and key JSC officials who had also been present at the September 12th meeting, as well as the newly appointed ex officio member who, at my request, had assisted the Board in their conduct of a fresh evaluation of the Safety Plans. As mentioned above, I had misgivings reconciling the relatively high score afforded to CHS under the Safety and Health Approach subfactor with the two plans' essentially equal detailed findings. It was reported to me that the ex officio member was provided with copies of relevant portions of the OMOH RFP and the two Safety Plans. She was not privy to the Board's Final Report or any other information regarding how the Plans had previously been evaluated and scored. The SEB then took her input, the previous input from the initial evaluation of the Safety Plans, along with their previously written findings, and performed their own reevaluation of the Plans. They then came to consensus agreement on revised findings and rescored the Safety and Health Approach subfactor.

The Board's consensus reevaluation provided me additional detail in the evaluation of the contents of the two plans. Wyle's Safety Plan was assessed as having one significant strength and two strengths and the subfactor was rated as Very Good overall. The significant strength was that the company proposed an excellent safety and health training program which identifies training required for all contract positions and provides a means to keep up with recurrent training requirements, which will ensure a safety conscious workforce which is ready to identify and correct any safety concerns. The strengths were that the Safety Plan demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements for successful, safe operations at JSC; and also demonstrated a very good understanding of hazard analysis and identification, including hazards that would not be controlled under the OMOH contract. The value to the Government of these strengths is that collectively they will reduce the potential for mishaps and incidents at JSC and promote a safe environment.

The Safety Plan of CHS was scored somewhat higher, but was also rated as Very Good overall, with one significant strength and three strengths. The significant strength was that CHS presented an outstanding plan, including schedule milestones, to obtain VPP Star status within 1 year of contract start. Strengths identified included an excellent Safety Plan that exhibits a solid, comprehensive understanding of the RFP requirements and of the overall JSC safety and health culture; a demonstrated commitment by management to JSC's safety and health culture; and a proposed tracking and reporting capability for hazards and lessons learned which will improve JSC's safety and health program. These strengths have value to the Government in that they will further strengthen the overall JSC safety and health program, which will likewise reduce the potential for mishaps and incidents at JSC and promote a safe environment.

In reviewing the revised findings of the SEB, I was satisfied that they reflected a more accurate representation of the relatively close value of the Safety Plans than the original findings had conveyed. In further discussing the matter with the Board members, they indicated to me that they were individually and collectively confident that the reevaluation was a more sound analysis than they had first conducted, and therefore of greater fidelity to the contents of the plans. Comparing the detailed findings regarding each Safety Plan, I concluded that although they were comparable and that each would implement a viable and proactive safety and health program, the Safety Plan offered by CHS, which included an outstanding plan to obtain VPP status, demonstrated commitment of CHS' management to safety, and an effective proposed tracking and reporting system, offered the better value to the Government in that it would improve the JSC safety culture to a somewhat greater extent than Wyle's plan. Accordingly, CHS enjoyed a lead under this subfactor.

As a result of the reevaluation of the Safety and Health Approach subfactor, it was noted that Wyle pulled slightly ahead of CHS in total Mission Suitability score, although both companies remained as Very Good overall.

As detailed above, under the Past Performance Factor the Board rated both companies as Excellent. The companies' various strengths are also discussed above. In comparing the two offerors, including the detailed data supporting the findings, it was apparent that Wyle had a noticeable advantage over CHS. Although both companies have a roughly equivalent volume of relevant experience and excellent references, it was noted that Wyle has greater experience with large dollar value contracts, which are more comparable to the scale of the OMOH contract contemplated here. In addition, though not separately called out as a strength by the SEB, I noted that Kelsey-Seybold, Wyle's team member and proposed subcontractor for a multitude of OMOH activities, is the current OMOH contractor and has held that directly relevant position with consistently excellent results, for many years at JSC. Although both Wyle and CHS are competent contractors capable of performing the OMOH effort, based on the SEB's and my own assessment of their relative strengths, I concluded that Wyle's past performance offered the greater value to the Government.

Finally, under the Cost Factor, as noted previously the probable costs were overall so close as to not be worthy of further consideration as a discriminator between the two proposals.

In weighing both proposals in making a selection, I first examined Mission Suitability. As discussed above, the proposal of Wyle clearly was superior in the two most heavily weighted subfactors, Technical Approach and Management Approach, in the substantive quality of both strengths and significant strengths. Although I considered all findings in my deliberations, I was particularly impressed with the numerous technical enhancements, the multi-faceted data integration plan, and excellent risk matrix of Wyle's technical approach, particularly when coupled with its outstanding program manager, excellent key personnel, committed critical personnel, Total Compensation Plan, backup staffing plan, communications plan, and innovative organizational structure. This combination of excellent technical approach and excellent management approach creates a whole that is

greater than the sum of its parts. These significant discriminators were enhanced by the various other strengths, as detailed above. As further discussed previously, I concluded that the offerors were essentially equal in the lowest weighted subfactor, Small Disadvantaged Business Plan, and that CHS had somewhat of an advantage in the subfactor of Safety and Health Approach. However, this slight edge was not enough to overcome Wyle's manifest superiority in Technical Approach and Management Approach. Therefore, I concluded that Wyle had a marked advantage over CHS in overall Mission Suitability, which was greater than apparent from a simple comparison of the numerical scores and adjectival ratings.

I next turned to the Past Performance Factor. In doing a more in-depth analysis of the various contracts the Board looked at, as well as the feedback from various references, I am satisfied that the strengths assessed by the SEB are representative of the companies' relative capabilities. In this Factor, Wyle had a measurable advantage over CHS. As detailed above, I was impressed by the substantive excellence exhibited by the Wyle team on a number of large dollar, directly relevant contracts, which offers greater value to the Government than the very able but more limited scope of the past performance of CHS. The Wyle team's greater experience with contracts of a comparable size to the OMOH contract, coupled with their experience as incumbents on current JSC contracts, ensures that Wyle will be able to transition into the OMOH contract effort with minimum disruption to critical ongoing operations at JSC, and that it will perform the OMOH contract at the expected level of excellence.

Both offerors submitted sound proposals, and I do not doubt that either of them would do a capable job in performing the OMOH contract. At first glance, the competition might appear to be at a dead heat in all three of the evaluation factors. However, in conducting my in-depth review of all the findings for both offerors, I am confident that there are true discriminators, as discussed above, which give Wyle the clear advantage in both Mission Suitability and Past Performance, the two factors which, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost, the Factor that is essentially equal between the two companies.

I, therefore, selected the proposal of Wyle Laboratories, Inc., as representing the best overall value to the Government.

Robert D. Cabana
Source Selection Authority

Date